Mr. Brian Kelly Outlook, de uty editor Washington Pest 1150 15 Dr., NW Washington, DC 20071 Dear Pr. "elly. Harold Weisberg 7627 Old Receiver Rd. Frederick, MD 21702

In your 3/3, not here until today, you say "I am not interested in...
ony evidence of who night" have killed King "other than Ray." This represents
the preconception of that issue of Cutlook and it misrepresents anything I
have written, including in my letter to "r. Downie.

So, I have no way of understanding what you mean in saying that "To date, I have seen little or no such evidence."

I'm almost  $\mathbb{C}4$  with much clse on my mind and my memory is not what it was, but I believe that what "wrote hr. Downie raised question of the journalistic honesty in presenting only one side and that from two with much to hide and  $\mathbb{N}D$  evidence that "ay was not and could not have been the assassin, which i developed and for the most part  $\overline{J}$ im lesar presented at the hearing of several decades ago.

If by this you mean what I think does not interest the Post, you'd be interested in proof that Tay was not the assassin, that I have, under oath and subject to cross examination.

Jim Lesar consulted my memory on a couple of ppints so  $^{\perp}$  know he and you have spoken. Fact is I urged him to limit what he gives you to our work, and that was without any pretense of solving the crime.

By interest was in making the unwilling system work. I regret that the courts as well as the press insisted on not working in their traditional way.

Sorry, I misread your lotter. What you do not understand and what the press missed entirely is that nother the JFK nor the ling easy was ever officially investigated or intended to be. Bach was an effort to make a precofeption appear to be reasonable. If the Post had not decided that beginning with the very first book on the Warren Contission at would not review any of mine you might be aware of this in the JFK from the documentation of it that is at the beginning of my INVER AGAIN! In this Ring case FEI records I got in CA 75-1996 in which Jim was my lawyer state that all it did was a fugitive investigation.

There are quite of few cases such as the crap you published of those seeking favors making up what they thought could get them favors, like Byers and Curtis, in those FEI files. There is also one rather provocative indication of who did the job. You are welcome to that if you want it. I have it from the FEI's files and I have it from the FEI's source. The FEI ignored it. Naturally.

adution

For you to expect a solution to the orms from Lesar is not only unfair, it is unprofessional why you published all that hagsquash from Dick Millings and Priscilla Johnson McMillan. Whose husband announced his book as presuming May's guilt and then saying that made the writing easier. That makes her an authority? A quotable source for the Fost? Or publishable as an authority?

Dick billings knew me from when he was at LIFE. he did not speak to me about the king assassination although I had been ay's investigator and rote the first book own on it. He and has committee began with the preconception of May's guilt and never looked at anything else. Until the KBI palmer Byers off on them. You might be interested in what the St. Louis Post Dispatch morgue has on that fine gentleman and what his situation was at the time he gulled the house assassins.

You publish what - describe as lies. I offered, with no demand of any kind, to address what you sublished. That you published lies is not of interest to you or to the was? On that oxime in particular? And all you are now interested in is what the Post did not demand of the FMI, a solution to the crime by anyone other than kay.

If you and the Post regard this as journalism, I do not.

Laudllur

Harold Weisberg

Hr. Brian Kelly Outlook, de uty editor Washington P.st 1150 15 Dr., HM Washington, DU 20071 Dear Pr. Pelly, Harold Weisberg 7627 Old Receiver Rd. Frederick, MO 21702

In your 3/3, not here until today, you say "I am not interested in... ony evidence of who night" have killed King "other than Ray." This represents the preconception of that issue of Cutlook and it misrepresents anything I have wriften, including in my letter to "r. Domic.

So, I have no way of under tappling what you mean in saying that "To date, I have seen little or no such evidence."

I'm almost  $\mathcal V$  with much clse on my mind and my memory is not what it was, but I believe that what I wrote  $^1\mathbf r$ . Formic raised question of the journalistic honcety in whose nting only one side and that from two with much to hide and  $\mathcal {ND}$  evidence that "ay was not and could not have been the appassin, which i developed and for the most part  $\mathcal J$  in  $^1\mathbf v$  car presented at the hearing of several decades ago.

If by this you mean what i think does not interest the Post, you'd be interested in proof that day was not the assassin, that i have, under oath and subject to cross examination.

Jim Losar consulted my memory on a couple of ppints so 1 know he and you have spoken. Fact is I urged high to limit what he gives you to our work, and that was without any pretense of solving the crime.

by interest was in maxim; the unwilling system work. I regret that the courts as well as the press insisted on not working in their traditional way.

Sorry, I microad your letter. What you do not ulderstand and what the press reseal and entirely is that neither the JFK nor the ling easy was ever officially investigated or intended to be. Each was an effort to make a pre-compation appear to be reasonable. If the Post had not decided that beginning with the very first book on the Varren Condision at would not review any of mine you might be swere of this in the JFK from the documentation of it that is at the beginning of my INVER ANALLY. In the Wing case FEX records I got in CA 75-1996 in which Jim was my lawyer state that all it did was a fugitive investigation.

There are quite a few cases such as the cump you published of those seeking favors making up what they thought could get them favors, like Byers and Curtis, in those PBI files. There is also one rather provocative indication of who did the job. You are unlease to that if you want it. I have it from the PBI's files and I have it from the FBI's source. The FBI ignored it. Naturally.

rolution

For you to explot a subtition to the crum from lesar is not only unfair, it is unpresented when you published all that ingugash from Dick Millings and Priscilla Johnson Medillan. Whose husband announced his book as presuming that and then saying that rade the writing easier. That makes her an authority? A quotable source for the foot? It publishable as an authority?

Dick "Hings know me from whom he was at LIFE. "e did not speak to me about the King assassination although I had bee "ay's investigator and rote the first book can on it. He and his committee began with the precompation of Say's guilt and mover looked at anything else. Until the EII palmon Pyers off on them. 'an might be interested in what the "t. louis Post Dispatch morgue has on that fine gentleman red what his situation was at the time he gulled the "ouse assassins.

You publish what I describe as lies. I offered, with no demand of any bind, to address that you subdished. That you published lies is not of intercht the you or to the test? In that wine in particular? And all you are now intercated in is what the Post did not demand of the FMI, a solution to the order by anyone other than Kay.

If you and the Post regard this as journalism, I do not.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisher